



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Glennallen Field Office
P.O. Box 147
Glennallen, Alaska 99588
<http://www.blm.gov/ak/st/en/fo/gdo.html>

Administration Determination (AD)/Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

**Applicant(s): Jayson Jones, Crested Butte Mountain Guides
Matt Wade, Peak Mountain Guides
Joe Stock, Certified Guide Federation**

**Case File Number: AA092715/AA087974/AA092893
DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2012-0006**



Location:

BLM managed lands within Thompson Pass encompassed completely by or in portions of: T. 7 S., R. 1 E., Sec. 19 and 20; T. 7 S., R. 1 W., Sec. 13 and 14, 22 to 27, 31 - 36; T. 8 S., R. 1 W., Sec. 2 - 9, 19 - 36; T. 8 S., R. 1 E., Sec. 19 - 22; T. 8 S., R. 4 W., Sec. 1 - 4, 9 to 14, 23 - 25 and 36; T. 9 S., R. 1 W., Sec. 6, C.R.M.

Prepared By:

Glennallen Field Office
December 27, 2011

Administrative Determination (AD)
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management
Glennallen Field Office

A). BLM Office: Glennallen Field Office

Case File Number: AA092715/AA087974/AA092893

Proposed Action Title/Type: Special Recreation Permit Renewal (2930)

Location of proposed Action: BLM managed lands within Thompson Pass encompassed completely by or in portions of: T. 7 S., R. 1 E., Sec. 19 and 20; T. 7 S., R. 1 W., Sec. 13 and 14, 22 to 27, 31 - 36; T. 8 S., R. 1 W., Sec. 2 - 9, 19 - 36; T. 8 S., R. 4 W., Sec. 1 - 4, 9 to 14, 23 - 25 R. 1 W., Sec. 6, C.R.M.

Description of Proposed Action: The applicants requested use period is March 1st –May 15, 2012. The proposal includes guided backcountry ski touring; approximately 110 user days have been requested between the three applicants. The guide client ratio is a maximum 1 guide to 4 clients. All activities will be conducted as day trips. Each operator incorporates Leave No Trace principles and passes these teachings onto their clients and instills how to be a responsible user of public lands in addition to helping them gain outdoor skills.

Applicants:

Jayson Jones, Crested Butte Mountain Guides

Matt Wade, Peak Mountain Guides

Joe Stock, Certified Guide Federation

B). Conformance with Land Use Plans

This type of recreational activity is part of the BLM mission of achieving quality land management under sustainable multiple use management guidelines and meeting the diverse needs of the people.

Land Use Plan Name: East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP)

Date Approved: September 2007

The proposed action is in conformance with the plan even though it is not specifically provided for because it is clearly consistent with the following planning decisions: (Page 35 of the EARMP Record of Decision 2007):

M. RECREATION

M-1: Goal

Manage recreation to maintain a diversity of recreational opportunities.

M-2: Allocations

Manage the following five areas as designated Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) and manage them according to the specified recreational emphasis outlined below. Allowable uses or limitations not described below (such as those for Lands and Realty) can be found in the tables in Appendix A of the East Alaska Proposed RMP/Final EIS or in the Lands and Realty section of this Approved Plan.

4. Tiekel Area

See Map 12, page 74. This area consists predominantly of State-selected lands, although there is some Native-selected land as well. This section describes two management scenarios: *interim* describes management of State- and Native-selected lands in the area until conveyance occurs, and *long-term* describes management of the lands if they are retained in long-term Federal ownership.

Interim Management (Tiekel Area)

Under interim management, **only the unencumbered** BLM lands in the Tiekel corridor would be designated as an **SRMA**. Objectives would be to manage for roaded natural, semi-primitive non-motorized, and semi-primitive motorized recreation experiences within the corridor. **OHVs would be “limited”** to designated trails on unencumbered BLM lands. Implementation-level considerations would include maintenance of specific trails as non-motorized (including snowmachines), construction of both non-motorized and motorized trail loops, and vehicle class restrictions (such as weight limitations) on specific trails. Where these designations affect trails on State-selected lands, the BLM would work with the State of Alaska on designations. **Existing withdrawals** against mineral leasing and locatable mineral entry within the transportation and utility corridor would remain in place. This area would be considered **a priority area for forest management**. This SRMA would not preclude timber management activities, but proposed timber sales would consider impacts to recreational facilities, experiences, and viewsheds. Temporary roads utilized for forestry access may be considered for retention if they are within areas managed for a roaded natural recreation experience. This SRMA is within the transportation and utility corridor; this would remain the area’s primary purpose.

Visitor use limits would be determined for **helicopter-supported commercial** uses, consistent with existing ROS classes. **Recreational facilities** would include updating and development of selected trailheads, construction of one wayside, and consideration of a bike trail utilizing the old Richardson Highway. The Egan cabin would be **considered for public use**.

C). Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

DOI-BLM-AK-012-2009-EA-016 Certified Guides Federation
DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2008-0037-EA Helicopter Supported Recreation

D). NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The proposed action is similar as previously analyzed in the NEPA documents referenced above. The majority of this activity takes place on lands administered by the State of Alaska.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA Document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given the current environmental concerns, interest, and resource values?

Yes, the range of alternatives presented is appropriate and sufficient in respect to the proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

No new information or circumstances have become available that would change the existing analysis.

4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action? Yes, the existing NEPA documentation stipulations and mitigation measures identified have covered the Proposed Action appropriately for the safety of visitors and the protection of federally administered resources.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed actions? The Impacts of the Proposed Action identified remain unchanged to those that were identified in the existing NEPA. Site specific impacts are addressed in the existing NEPA document.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes, cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

The existing NEPA adequately addresses public involvement and interagency review.

E). Interdisciplinary Analysis: See attached interdisciplinary review documentation.

F). Mitigation Measures: In addition to the standard recreation permit stipulations for commercial operations, the following special stipulations are adopted and shall apply to this permit. (See attachment)

G). Conclusion: The proposed action does not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation and is in conformance with the East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP/RMP) 2007.

s/s Denton Hamby
Outdoor Recreation Planner

3/5/2012
Date

s/s Elizabeth Maclean
Glennallen Field Manager

3/7/2012
Date

Assessment of Undertakings Not Subject to Further Section 106 Review Glennallen Field Office

GDO Document No. GFO-11-05

BLM Serial No. AA092715 **Environmental Assessment No.** DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-002-DNA

Class of Inventory: No Further Review

Dates of Inspection: 01/13/2011

Inspector: John Jangala

Maps: Valdez 1:250,000

Applicant: Matt Wade, Peak Mountain Guides LLC

Location: The project will be conducted within the Thompson Pass vicinity between the Richardson Highway and the surrounding mountains, more specifically the project will occur in; T.6S., R.1E.; T.6S.,R.1W.; T.7S.,R.1W.; T.7S., R.1E.; T.8S.,R.1W.; T.8S., R.4W.; T.8S., R.7W.; T.8S., R.8W.; T.8S., R.1E.; T.8S., R.2E.; T.9S., R.2W.; T.10S., R.4W.; T.10S., R.5W.; T.10S., R.6W.; Copper River Meridian

Project Description: The Bureau of Land Management proposes to permit the Peak Mountain Guides to use public lands in the vicinity of Thompson Pass to conduct guided backcountry day long ski and mountaineering courses from the Richardson Highway into the local mountains. These tours will be conducted on snow or ice covered surfaces and no surface disturbance will occur.

Acreage: Unknown

Recommendations: According to the Protocol for Managing Cultural Resources on Lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Alaska, between the Bureau of Land Management and the State Historic Preservation Officer, signed April 17, 1998, this undertaking is not subject to further Section 106 review (Appendix 2: Category One). The project will involve less than one square meter of ground disturbance and will take place on areas with snow cover and frozen ground. As long as the applicant adheres to the attached stipulations, the applicant may proceed as proposed in the application. However, if heritage or paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the project, the project will cease and the Glennallen Field Office, cultural resource staff, shall be notified.

The following stipulation should be attached to the permit: "There shall be no disturbance of any archaeological or historical sites, including graves and remains of cabins, and no collection of any artifacts whatsoever. Also, collection of vertebrate fossils, including mammoths and mastodon bones, tusks etc., is strictly prohibited. If historic resources are encountered then all artifacts will be respectfully left in place and the Glennallen Field Office's cultural resources staff will be notified immediately. "

Signed: /s/John Jangala 1/13/2011

John W. Jangala
Glennallen Field Office Archaeologist (AK-020)

Compliance with ANILCA Section 810

E.A No.: DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2011-0002-DNA

Applicant(s): Matt Wade (Peak Mountain Guides LLC)

Proposed Action: The BLM Glennallen Field Office (GFO) proposes to grant Matt Wade a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to conduct ski mountaineering courses from 25 March 2011 to 10 April 2011 at Thompson Pass in public lands generally west of Mount Billy Mitchell and east of Sheep Creek, within two miles from the Richardson Highway.

Location: Thompson Pass

Township/Range: Copper River Meridian, T.6S., R.1E.; T.6S., R.1W.; T.7S., R.1W.; T.7S., R.1E.; T.8S., R.1W.; T.8S., R.4W.; T.8S., R.7W.; T.8S., R.8W.; T.8S., R.1E.; T.8S., R.2E.; T.9S., R.2W.; T.10S., R.4W.; T.10S., R.5W.; T.10S., R.6W.

Map: please see application

Evaluation by: Merben R. Cebrian

Discretionary Action?: Yes

Categorical Exclusion?:

Type of Assessment / Sources: Review of application materials, subsistence database, local knowledge, and interviews with staff knowledgeable of the area and the proposed action.

Effect of the proposal on subsistence uses and needs:

Fisheries: None. The proposed action is to occur during the winter months and early spring when snow pack covers the affected area. Therefore, the proposed action does not have a significant effect on subsistence uses and needs.

Wildlife: None. The proposed action is to occur outside of moose hunting season. There are no recent harvests of caribou recorded in the affected area in March. Big game such as moose are present in the area but would temporarily avoid human disturbance when the proposed activity takes place. Small game and upland birds are also found in the area but the proposed action is limited in duration and only adjacent to the road. Therefore, the proposed action does not have a significant effect on subsistence resource uses and needs.

Other resources: The proposed action will not significantly affect other harvestable resources such as berries, willows, and spruce roots. Berries are patchy within the area, while willows generally line disturbed areas directly adjacent to the road and along creeks. Snow pack in the area is generally deep especially in gulleys and along creeks. Ski mountaineering activities will likely not affect vegetation underneath the snow cover. Therefore, the proposed action does not have a significant effect on subsistence uses and needs.

Expected reduction, if any, in the availability of resources due to alteration in resource distribution, migration, or location: None. The proposed action would not significantly alter the distribution, migration, or location of subsistence resources. Moose are highly mobile and may use other lands in the vicinity temporarily

during the proposed activity. Small game and upland birds may also temporarily avoid human encounters during this time period.

Expected limitation, if any, in the access of subsistence users resulting from the proposal: None. Access to subsistence resources will not be hampered by the proposed action. The proposed action does not create a permanent obstruction to subsistence users.

Availability of other lands, if any, for the purpose sought to be achieved: Other lands are available for the purpose sought to be achieved. However, the affected area is in close proximity to the base of operation of the applicant.

Other alternatives, if any, which would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes: The only other alternative that would reduce or eliminate the use, occupancy, or disposition of public lands needed for subsistence purposes is to not allow or permit any activities that conflict with subsistence uses. However, such an alternative is not viable because the BLM manages public lands for multiple uses.

Finding: The proposed action will not significantly restrict subsistence uses and needs in or near the area of the proposed action. Access to subsistence resources will not be hampered by the proposed action. There is no reasonable foreseeable significant decrease in abundance in harvestable resources and in the distribution of harvestable resources due to the proposed action.

s/s Merben R Cebrian
Merben R. Cebrian
Wildlife Biologist
BLM, Glennallen Field Office

26 January 2011
Date

Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Glennallen Field Office

NEPA Interdisciplinary Review

Project Name: Recreational Ski-Touring Thompson Pass

Casefile Number: AA092715/AA087974/AA092893

NEPA Document Number: DOI-BLM-AKA-020-2012-0006-DNA

NEPA Preparer: Denton Hamby

Please return to preparer by: **1/25/2012**

Staff Specialist	Resource Area	Comments Provided Yes / No	Date Reviewed
Brenda Becker	Lands and Realty	Yes	1/25/12
Marcia Butorac	Recreation and Facilities	No	1/18/2012
Wildlife Specialist	ANILCA, Section 810	Covered in previous review	1/2011
Wildlife Specialist	T&E Animals		1/2011
Wildlife Specialist	T&E Plants		1/2011
Wildlife Specialist	Wildlife		1/2011
Heath Emmons	Wild and Scenic Rivers	No	1/9/2012
Marnie Graham	Public Affairs	Yes	1/12/12
Denton Hamby	Special Recreation Use	Preparer	1/25/12
Denton Hamby	Visual Resources	No	1/25/12
Brad Honerlaw	Law Enforcement		
Alysia White	Law Enforcement	No	1/12/2012
John Jangala	Cultural Heritage	Covered in previous review	
John Jangala	Paleontology		
Cory Larson	Travel Management	no	1/11/2012
James Whitlock	Minerals	n/a	
Ben Seifert	Fire Management	No	1/11/2012
Ben Seifert	Forestry	No	1/11/2012
Ben Seifert	Invasive Weeds	No	1/11/2012
Mike Sondergaard	Soils	No	1/11/2012
Mike Sondergaard	Air Quality	No	1/11/2012
Tim Sundlov	Riparian & Wetlands	No	1/11/2012
Mike Sondergaard	Water Quality	No	1/11/2012
Tim Sundlov	Fish Biology	No	1/11/2012
Joseph Hart	Hazardous Materials	n/a	
Elijah Waters	Branch Chief - Resources	No	2/23/12

Authorized Officer Review: Elizabeth Maclean

Date: 3/7/12